

Sign In or Sign Up

Subscribe/Manage Account Place Ad LAT Store Jobs Cars Real Estate Rentals Classifieds Custom Publishing

## Los Angeles Times | OPINION

AB 52

LOCAL U.S. WORLD BUSINESS SPORTS ENTERTAINMENT HEALTH LIVING TRAVEL OPINION DEALS

Weekly Ad

EDITORIALS OP-ED LETTERS OPINION L.A. READERS' REP

IN THE NEWS: OBAMA AND ISRAEL | TIM PAWLENTY | MAY 21 | KAREEM ABDUL-JABBAR | ARNOLD SCHWARZENEGGER

Search

Schedule an appointment with California's most experienced spine specialists.

1-800-CEDARS-1 (1-800-233-2771)

CEDARS-SINAI  
SPINE CENTER

## EDITORIAL

## Watching the health insurers

A bill would let state regulators block rate hikes they consider unreasonable, just as they can do for most other types of insurance.



Tweet

(35)

April 26, 2011



(Alex Nabaum, For The Times)

Over the past year, two major health insurers in California have proposed eye-popping rate increases, only to settle for smaller hikes after a public outcry. Now lawmakers are considering a proposal to let state regulators block rate hikes they consider unreasonable, just as they can do for most other types of insurance. Industry lobbyists argue that premiums are rising not because they're profiteering, but because healthcare costs are climbing. That's certainly part of the explanation. But lawmakers should still approve the bill, because it would plug a troubling gap in the healthcare reform effort.

As of Jan. 1, insurers must give California regulators 60 days' notice of any premium increase, and must have independent actuaries determine whether their rates are reasonable. But state law doesn't give the Department of Managed Health Care, which regulates HMOs, or the Department of Insurance, which oversees other insurance company offerings, the power to stop excessive or unreasonable rates from going into effect. All they can do is cajole insurers to scale back increases or seek rebates later if the new federal limits on administrative expenses aren't met.

## RELATED



Diagnosis as disease

The bill by Assemblyman Mike Feuer (D-Los Angeles), AB 52, would apply the same approach to health coverage that the state applies to auto and homeowners' policies. Regulators would have the power to review new rates before they went into effect and reject premiums that were excessive, inadequate or unfairly discriminatory.

Insurers say they're not to blame for skyrocketing premiums — the real cause is the rapid increase in healthcare costs. In addition, their overhead is limited by the new federal

healthcare law, which requires them to spend at least 80% of their premiums on medical costs. Finally, they say the competition among insurers is intense enough to prevent price-gouging.

## L.A. Times on Facebook



advertisement

City of Hope

BREAST  
PROSTATE  
COLON  
LUNG  
BRAIN  
ALL CANCERS

City of Hope  
has answers  
to your cancer.

## Schwarzenegger's failings »



**Editorial:** This time, the former governor's sexual misconduct has upended the lives of his wife and family | Discuss

## OPINION: MOST VIEWED



1. In California, 'job killers' that aren't

2. DSK and France's code of



Doyle McManus: The choice between low taxes vs. Medicare benefits



Reforming healthcare reform

ADS BY GOOGLE

**Low Cost Kaiser Plans**  
Free instant quotes on Kaiser Permanente. Plans from \$75 a month!  
KaiserQuotes.com

**Medicare Insurance Plans**  
Know Options & Get the Right Plan. Advice from Anthem Blue Cross!  
Medicare-Anthem.com/MedicarePlans

**BrokerSIS**  
Self Insurance Solutions for employee benefits brokers  
www.brokersis.com

The fundamental problem with the current system, though, is that insurers and healthcare providers have a shared incentive to raise premiums. Providers want insurers to pay more to offset stingy Medicare and Medicaid reimbursements. And the new federal caps on overhead mean that the easiest way for insurers to increase revenue is to promise more to doctors and hospitals, which would justify proportionally higher administrative expenses and profits.

Insurance Commissioner Dave Jones, who sponsored similar bills when he was in the Assembly, argues that AB 52 would let regulators combat the cycle of ever-increasing premiums by pressing insurers to strike better deals with providers. Those could include new risk-sharing arrangements that reward providers for keeping patients healthy, rather than basing their pay on the number of procedures they perform.

Just as important, the new healthcare law requires American adults to buy coverage, giving insurers the same kind of captive market they enjoy for auto policies — a market that's even more competitive than health insurance. That's a compelling reason for regulators to provide the same level of scrutiny to health premiums as they do to auto rates.



3. 9th Circuit nominee Goodwin Liu deserves a vote



4. The wrong sites for solar



5. The Middle East mess



6. Doyle McManus: Fighting mosques in the name of freedom



7. L.A. Unified's librarians on trial



8. Arnold Schwarzenegger's failings



9. Meghan Daum: Breaking comedy's raunch barrier



10. California's high-speed train wreck



Copyright © 2011, Los Angeles Times



Tweet

(35)

« Previous Story

More Editorials

Next Story »



Greenhouse gases:  
Too hot for the courts



Let sun shine on  
dependency court

ADS BY GOOGLE

**Small Company Healthcare**  
From UnitedHealthcare Get a No-Cost Quote Online!  
UHC.com/SmallBusiness

**The BirthPlace At UCLA**  
Visit Us Today To Learn More About Our Neonatal Intensive Care Unit.  
www.uclahealth.org

**Buy Smarter, Save 30% on**  
Group Health Premiums w/o reducing benefits/changing carriers  
www.trowbridgeins.com/new/group.php

## In Case You Missed It...



**Review: 'Pirates of the Caribbean: On Stranger Tides'**



**Schwarzenegger puts Hollywood comeback on hold**



**Simers: This seems pretty small of Kareem Abdul-Jabbar**



**Opinion: Is college still worth it?**

Comments (35)

Add / View comments | Discussion FAQ

LiberalReason at 1:13 PM April 27, 2011

Insurances have a captive market. You can't just switch providers - if you have any kind of health history they'll either straight out deny you or charge more than anyone can afford. So they shouldn't be allowed to raise rates either. The whole idea of insurance other than a blind pool is nonsense. If they want to know your condition and insure you accordingly, you're screwed.

rjbischof at 12:04 PM April 27, 2011

@pogi455 The cognitive failure here is that insurance, whether run by independent corporations or government agencies, ultimately must be actuarially sound. The latter may circumvent reality for generations by exempting itself from GAAP rules it enforces on private industry but eventually it will exhaust all revenues due to lack of market forces and begin

## LA DEALS



\$50 for membership and 1 month of premium water home delivery (\$150 value)

## The Latest | NEWS AS IT HAPPENS

**Baseball: The surprising Channel League** - Varsity Times Insider 05/20/2011, 8:21 a.m.

**Father charged with hitting daughter's boyfriend with metal rod** - L.A. Now 05/20/2011, 8:19 a.m.